

Atty. Docket No. FR91999007US1
(590.106)

REMARKS

Applicant and the undersigned are most grateful for the time and effort accorded the instant application by the Examiner. The Office is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action in light of the following remarks. Applicant intends no change in scope of the claims by the changes made by this amendment and has introduced no new matter to the specification.

Applicants note the acknowledgement of the claim for priority. The comment that Applicants have not filed a certified copy of the priority document is not understood. Attached hereto is a copy of the Express Mail Certificate submitted with the instant application at filing on May 23, 2001. As noted therein, a "Certified Copy of European Patent Application No. 00480047.0" was submitted with the application when filed. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 were pending in the instant application at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 9, and 14 are independent claims; the other are independent claims. All claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Garcia. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the present rejections are hereby respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Garcia discloses the display of bid / ask curves along with bid / ask trade bars. As discussed in the specification (Col, 6, lines 52-54), the bid / ask trade bars comprise three sections which supply new information unavailable in the prior art. Garcia then goes on

Atty. Docket No. FR91999007US1
(590.106)

to describe the characteristics of each section. As discussed in Garcia (Col. 6, linrs 54-58), these trade bars represent percentage of sales that occur at the bid /ask prices or between both. No particular computation is performed with the "bid / ask, trade, price" information displayed in Garcia. Rather, the information displayed in Garcia is the raw information.

In contrast, the present invention does not display the raw information displayed in Garcia. Indeed, there is a specific interpretation of the raw or real information on the stock option (i.e., the bid / ask, prices). As present written, Claim 1 specifies that computation is performed on the raw data. For example, in step b the standard description (raw information) is converted into a candlestick pattern ("converting the standard description of each stock option's price into a candlestick pattern chosen among a predetermined typology of a plurality of candlestick patterns"). The candlestick pattern associated with each stock option is chosen from among a group of predefined patterns (the patterns typology). This is illustrated in Figure 4, discussed on Page 7 (lines 14-21), and further discussed on Page 9, line 29 through Page 11, line 8.

Additionally, in step c of Claim 1, there is a comparison of sub-time periods to allocate a code that is chosen from a group of codes (the code typology) ("comparing the standard description of the current sub-time period to the standard description of the previous sub-time period, and allocating a comparison code, the comparison code being chosen among a predetermined typology of a plurality of comparison codes"). This is illustrated on Figure 5, and discussed on Page 11, lines 10-30. Similarly, in step d there

Atty. Docket No. FR91999007US1
(590.106)


is an assignment of a trend indicator to sub-time periods, and in step e, the results of steps (b), (c), and (d) are computed with exploratory data analysis.

It is respectfully submitted that the features just described are neither taught nor suggested by the applied art. Garcia fails to teach or suggest any computation involving the raw data. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion in Garcia of an adaptation of the stocks and sub-time period to later compute a set of characteristics of the time periods. While the above discussion was directed to independent Claim 1, it is equally applicable to the other independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-14 distinguish over the applied art and are thus in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is hereby earnestly solicited.

In the event it appears the claims will not be allowed, the Office is invited to call the undersigned to discuss the claims prior to the issuance of a second Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley D. Ference III
Registration No. 33,879

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
400 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143
(412) 741-8400
(412) 741-9292 - Facsimile

Attachment

Attorney for Applicants